

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 28, 2004. Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 19-23 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 3 and 12 have been amended as to matters of form only. Claims 1, 11, and 19 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected under 35 U.S.C. § 132 to Applicants' Amendment filed on March 29, 2004, asserting that the Amendment introduced new matter into the disclosure. In particular, the Office Action states that the feature of "the control apparatus determine[s] according to the control signal, whether or not to transmit a command for operating the specific function from the control apparatus to the controlled apparatus" is not supported by the original disclosure. Initially, Applicants note that the wherein recitation of Claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein the control apparatus includes a receiving unit adapted to receive a control signal from the operation apparatus, and a control unit adapted to determine, according to the control signal, whether or not to transmit a command for operating the specific function from the control apparatus to the controlled apparatus." Support in the specification, as filed, for this feature can be found at least from pages 37-39, and steps S201-S204, S209, and S210 as shown in Figure 14. In this context, the recitation of "command for operating the specific function" in Claim 1 corresponds to the "DIRECT-ACTION command." (See page 37 of the specification, lines 1-19.)

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that no new matter was introduced by the Amendment filed on March 29, 2004. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 132 objection is requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-5, 11-15, and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action stated that the specification fails to disclose the recitations of “the control apparatus determine[s] according to the control signal, whether or not to transmit a command for operating the specific function from the control apparatus to the controlled apparatus,” in Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 19, and 22¹; “the control apparatus is adapted to determine according to the control signal whether or not to move a cursor on the operation panel,” in Claims 3, 13 and 21; and “the control apparatus is adapted to change the operation panel according to data transmitted from the controlled apparatus” in Claims 5, 15, and 23.

In regard to the feature of “the control apparatus is adapted to determine according to the control signal whether or not to move a cursor on the operation panel,” in Claims 3, 13 and 21, Applicants submit that this feature is supported by the specification, as filed, at page 38, and steps S203 and S208 shown in Fig. 14.

In regard to the feature of “the control apparatus is adapted to change the operation panel according to data transmitted from the controlled apparatus” as recited in claims 5, 15, and 23, Applicants submit that this feature is supported by the specification,

^{1/} See the discussion above for support in the specification for this feature.

as filed, at pages 38 and 39, and steps S207 and S212 shown in Fig. 14. In this context, the claimed “data transmitted from the controlled apparatus” corresponds to “GUI data.”

In view of the foregoing, it is believed the Section 112 rejection has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,594,509 (Florin et al.), and rejected Claims 3, 5, 13, 15, 21, and 23 as being unpatentable over Florin et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,351 (Hahm). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a control system that includes a control apparatus adapted to receive an operation panel for operating a controlled apparatus from the controlled apparatus, and to display the operation panel on a display unit. The control system also includes an operation apparatus having a first operation unit for operating the operation panel and a second operation unit for operating a specific function of the controlled apparatus. The control apparatus includes a receiving unit adapted to receive a control signal from the operation apparatus, and a control unit adapted to determine, according to the control signal, whether or not to transmit a command for operating the specific function from the control apparatus to the controlled apparatus.

Among other important features of Claim 1 is that the control apparatus receives an operation panel for operating a controlled apparatus from the controlled apparatus and displays the operation panel on a display unit. The control apparatus includes a receiving unit adapted to receive a control signal from an operation apparatus having a first operation unit for operating the operation panel, a second operation unit for

operating a specific function of the controlled apparatus, and includes a control unit adapted to determine, according to the control signal, whether or not to transmit a command for operating the specific function from the control apparatus to the controlled apparatus.

Florin et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a method and apparatus for an audio-visual interface for the display of multiple levels of information on a display. Florin et al. discusses an AV transceiver 54 which selectively supplies a TV input 50 and inputs from AV equipment 56-57 to a TV apparatus 58 (Figs. 1-2). The transceiver 54 can be operated by a remote control device 60 (column 8, lines 42 and 43) which includes menu keys, cursor control keys, numerical keys and AV control keys (column 11, line 44 et seq.). In this connection, Florin et al. discloses in Fig. 36 a display 420 which is displayed in response to operation of the menu key to select the input apparatus (column 21, line 55 et seq.). However, this graphic overlay panel 420 is not received from a controlled apparatus, which is the AV equipment 57, for example, and Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Florin et al. that would teach or suggest the control apparatus, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed patentable over Florin et al.

Independent Claims 11 and 19 are apparatus and method claims, respectively, that include features (such as the control apparatus) similar to Claim 1, as discussed above, and accordingly, are believed to be patentable over Florin et al. for at least these reasons.


A review of the other art of record, including Hahm, has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed

above, as applied against the independent claims herein. Therefore, those claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank A. DeLucia
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,476

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 443150v1